



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

have an opportunity of offering such explanations or reasons in support of them as may be in my power, and then that the accounts may be finally closed.' Nothing more needs be added, we believe, to vindicate Dr Franklin from censure or suspicion in regard to this subject.

We might pursue these inquiries through all their ramifications, and we are confident that the result would in every instance contribute to exalt the character and brighten the fame of Franklin. Prejudice has done him a wrong, which time and truth will adjust. He was an early, a true, a steady, an enlightened friend to his country, and for half a century a most able and faithful defender of her liberties. The more his political principles, designs, and acts are scrutinized, the more they will be found to demand the admiration, the respect, and the gratitude of his countrymen.

---

ART. IX.—*Memoir, Correspondence, and Miscellanies, from the Papers of THOMAS JEFFERSON.* Edited by Thomas Jefferson Randolph. 4 vols. 8vo. Charlottesville. F. Carr & Co. 1829.

THE publication of this work has excited an uncommon degree of interest. Mr Jefferson was an active leader of public opinion, from his first appearance as a politician until the close of his political career, a period of forty years; and he continued to influence by his advice the course of public measures, long after he had withdrawn himself within the shade of private life. He has stood before two generations. The same political doctrines which he first espoused, he advocated with persevering consistency long after most of those who were his original adherents or opponents had disappeared from the world. He survived to review the judgment which had been passed upon him by one age, and these posthumous documents will establish the rank which he is to hold in the estimation of the present age and of posterity.

There are no subjects so attractive to our curiosity or our sympathy, as the fortunes and trials, the reflections and purposes of eminent men. We love to watch their movements, as they appear conspicuously on the public stage, whether at

the head of armies, or uttering in the senate the public voice. We take an equal pleasure in following them into the retreat of the tent or the cabinet; to overhear secret debates and resolves, which are to determine the course of great events and decide the destiny of a nation. But it is a luxury of curiosity to be able to accompany a great man in the relaxation of his private hours; to be admitted under his roof, when he is relieved from the cares of office; to see him in the intercourse of domestic relations; to notice the character of his mind, when released from the restraints of public exhibition; to hear his soliloquies when he is off his guard; or gather from his confidence the maxims and lessons which are the result of his experience and reflection. The world is not willing to lose sight of a conspicuous man, as soon as he is retired from office. After the season of activity is past, there frequently remains the most valuable and interesting portion of life; when passion having subsided, the mind can survey the past with unclouded view; can connect causes with their effects; can follow virtue through trials and obstructions to its reward; can discover wherefore prudence has failed and folly has triumphed; and reconcile with the natural order of providence those events which have been called caprices of fortune. Had the Emperor Napoleon won the battle of Waterloo, he might have continued to hold his power, till the last pageant had conducted him to the vaults of St Denis. The world would have lost that part of his story which now forms its moral; the shade which now gives relief and effect to the picture. The cruel state of security, in which the fears or the vengeance of his conquerors placed him, afforded to the last years of his life a leisure for calm retrospection, which successful ambition would not have allowed. He employed it in commentaries on his various fortune; in divulging his secret designs; unveiling the motives of his policy; the origin of his errors; in a word, in explaining the wonders of his reign. By becoming his own historian, he has made the last scene, the most useful of his life. Had his seclusion been voluntary retirement, he would have acquired by his merit that interest, which the sympathy of the world has generally accorded to his misfortune.

The eminent men, who have been willing to record the events of the times in which they were actors, and ingenuously to describe the part they took in them, have seldom resorted to a most natural expedient; one which anticipates and supersedes

the task of historical composition. It consists merely in the arrangement of a series of their own epistolary correspondence. And yet letters have a natural charm which cannot well be transfused into methodical history; for we may affirm, that while it is a most difficult task of literature to give spirit to a long narration of events foreign to the writer, there are few letters written under the excitement of the occasion, which fail of that success. Such writers seize the interest before it evaporates. Events, as soon as they have gone by and satisfied our curiosity, lose some lines of their first impression. Hopes or apprehensions, which once brought them near to us, gradually subside, and at length what first enlisted the feelings becomes, by lapse of time, a matter of speculation. So that it is a vain effort, which the historian makes, to impart to remote transactions the animation they once possessed. The colors have faded and cannot be perfectly revived. The botanist who describes flowers from the rich herbarium of Linnæus, may accurately show their distinctive characters, but their tints and forms, and all that delighted the eye, are lost. It is this curiosity to view the thought exactly as it springs up and unfolds itself in the mind, that is the source of the pleasure peculiar to epistolary writing. The effusions of friendship, the impulses of passion, common occurrences, and domestic incidents are attractive, when related without affectation of elegance or feeling. It is on this principle, that so many of the familiar letters of Cicero, not intended to last beyond the occasions on which they were written, have been handed down to posterity, while all his historical works have been suffered to disappear and be irrecoverably lost.

The correspondence of Mr Jefferson, contained in these volumes, commenced in the year 1775, and continued almost without interruption till June, 1826. He secured the advantage of perpetuating the part which he held in it, by the uniform practice of retaining copies of his own letters. As they were written mostly on political topics which occupied the public attention at their several dates; and the writer was, during a long life, intimately conversant with two eventful revolutions, the American and French; deeply interested in the fate of our country during its subsequent difficulties and divisions; and one of the principal organs of administration under the constitution of the United States, the consummation and reward of so much effort; these letters, addressed to the most distinguished men

of the age, must furnish very important and interesting materials for history. But political subjects never excluded from the mind of Mr Jefferson those which were still more congenial to it ; the researches of philosophy, the developement of the mind, the discussion of morals, and whatever he thought would contribute to the benefit of mankind. The most impressive of his letters are those dictated by the kind and paternal feelings that distinguished his character ; in which, without pretension or disguise, he gives his advice on the subject of education and conduct to those who regarded him as their friend and Mentor. He makes the following remarks in a letter to one of them on the subject of travel.

‘ This makes men wiser, but less happy. When men of sober age travel, they gather knowledge, which they may apply usefully for their country ; but they are subject ever after to recollections mixed with regret ; their affections are weakened by being extended over more objects ; and they learn new habits which cannot be gratified when they return home. Young men who travel are exposed to all these inconveniences in a higher degree, to others still more serious, and do not acquire that wisdom for which a previous foundation is requisite, by repeated and just observations at home. The glare of pomp and pleasure is analogous to the motion of the blood ; it absorbs all their affection and attention ; they are torn from it as from the only good in this world, and return to their home as to a place of exile and condemnation. Their eyes are for ever turned back to the object they have lost, and its recollection poisons the residue of their lives. Their first and most delicate passions are hackneyed on unworthy objects here, and they carry home the dregs, insufficient to make themselves or any body else happy. Add to this, that a habit of idleness, an inability to apply themselves to business is acquired, and renders them useless to themselves and their country. These observations are founded in experience. There is no place where your pursuit of knowledge will be so little obstructed by foreign objects, as in your own country, nor any, wherein the virtues of the heart will be less exposed to be weakened. Be good, be learned, and be industrious, and you will not want the aid of travelling to render you precious to your country, dear to your friends, happy within yourself. I repeat my advice, to take a great deal of exercise, and on foot. Health is the first requisite after morality.’ Vol II. pp. 218, 219.

To expose in one view the state of the thoughts, opinions, and motives, during a whole life, would be to most men an unwilling and hazardous undertaking. Yet the faithful exhibition

of letters written in a long series of years, in every variety of fortune, in the confidence of secrecy as well as unreserved assurance, does in fact present the entire character. Most men at the approach of death are desirous that those papers which have survived the topics on which they were written, though they might be perused without discredit, should be destroyed. The memorials of former times of health, activity, and pleasure, are taken up with the melancholy reflection, that the occasions are gone, and they are consigned to the flames with the hope, that, without their aid, our friends will hold us in their minds by the recollection of all the merit they have witnessed in us, and allow our faults to pass into indulgent oblivion. But Mr Jefferson, anticipating the claim which the interest or curiosity of the public would make upon his posthumous papers, voluntarily yielded them for publication; and conscious that he had put no disguise on his opinions when living, he felt no apprehension from an exposure of them after his death.

Prefixed to Mr Jefferson's correspondence is a summary biography from his own pen, of which the principal events are now generally known. It appears, his early acquisitions as an accomplished scholar were due chiefly to his own efforts, assisted with less than the usual aid from instructors. Before he was fifteen years old, he lost his father. At the age of seventeen he was placed at the university of William and Mary, where he remained only two years. The want of parental protection, however, was more than compensated by the spirit of determination and self-dependence which the necessity of personal effort inspired, and by the friendship of a few distinguished persons, which his unfolding merit attracted. His early instructor, Dr Small, to whom he acknowledges most gratefully his obligation for the first views he had 'of the expansion of science and of philosophy,' procured him the acquaintance of George Wythe. This excellent and learned man directed his legal studies, and introduced him to the notice of the public. He became a member of the legislature of Virginia in 1769; and his progress through all the honors which his native state could bestow to the highest dignities recognised by the American republic, was as rapid as the march of the revolution. His name was associated with its great events. He was among the first to commit himself and his future destinies on the great question of resistance to the encroachments of arbitrary prerogative, and of the right of the people to gov-

ern themselves. The instructions which he submitted to the Convention of Virginia for the government of their deputies to the first Congress, and the Declaration of Independence which he penned, are the avowals of principles he first imbibed—the principles of republican government. It was not owing to disappointment in his hopes of preferment, the chagrin of having his merits neglected by the pride of an aristocracy, or oppressed by the influence of the crown, that he espoused the popular cause. Among his first intimate friends was the Governor of the state, Fauquier. ‘With him, and at his table, Dr Small and Mr Wythe, his *amici omnium horarum*, and myself,’ says Mr Jefferson, ‘formed a *partie quarrée*, and to the habitual conversations on these occasions I owed much instruction.’ Till the war actually began, his principles allowed him to advocate colonial connexion with England; and to recognise in that power the right to direct the external commerce of the country. But all control over the essential privileges of freemen, the right of making laws for the government of their persons and the protection of their property, he considered arbitrary and inadmissible. In a letter to John Randolph, Esq. then in England (1775), he says,

‘I wish no false sense of honor, no ignorance of our real intentions, no vain hope that partial concessions of right will be accepted, may induce the ministry to trifle with accommodation till it shall be out of their power ever to accommodate. If, indeed, Great Britain, disjoined from her colonies, be a match for the most potent nations of Europe, with the colonies thrown into their scale, they may go on securely. But if they are not assured of this, it would be certainly unwise, by trying the event of another campaign, to risk our accepting a foreign aid, which perhaps may not be obtainable but on condition of everlasting avulsion from Great Britain. This would be thought a hard condition to those who still wish for reunion with their parent country. I am sincerely one of those, and would rather be in dependence on Great Britain, properly limited, than on any nation upon earth, or than on no nation. But I am one of those, too, who, rather than submit to the rights of legislating for us, assumed by the British Parliament, and which late experience has shown they will so cruelly exercise, would lend my hand to sink the whole island in the ocean.’ Vol. i. p 151.

The belief of Mr Jefferson that all legitimate government is founded on the consent of the people, and subject to their control, was not less firm than his conviction of the duty of en-

lightening the public mind, and of removing those institutions which obstruct the liberal expansion of the intellect. In his native state, it was due to him that the first restraints were taken from religion. He advocated and partially effected the passing of laws for the systematic diffusion of knowledge by schools of useful instruction. He assisted in reducing the in-artificial mass of laws into a consistent and intelligible code, clearing a pathway through its perplexities, and breaking up the covers of chicanery. As the law of primogeniture, aided in its operation by that of entails, had, by accumulating and perpetuating property in certain branches of families, produced a species of aristocracy, he succeeded in having them both repealed. Extirpating thus the weeds which encumbered the ground, he prepared it for the growth of republican principles. In old countries, institutions acquire by age, which always inspires veneration, though it protect error, so firm a hold on the prejudices of mankind, that the reformation of an abuse is rarely effected at once. Innovation is admitted only by compromise. An unsightly ruin is retained, lest its removal weaken the support of some better edifice. Prescription becomes right, and ancient usage is an argument against further improvement. But in Virginia, the respect for the institutions and forms of society, which had been modelled on those of England, gradually yielded to the growing conviction that they were not congenial to the spirit of the age, nor compatible with the character of the people. Mr Jefferson, overcoming the obstinate resistance made by the patrons of the ancient system of laws, at length introduced one more liberal and republican. All this he accomplished, not by the force of popular eloquence, gaining a tumultuous and unreflecting vote. He was not distinguished as a public speaker. His voice did not possess the strength nor the intonations necessary to produce great popular effect. His influence was the force of an intellect exerting itself in written appeals to the understanding, or in unambitious discussions which carried persuasion by their candor and good sense. Those who excelled more in declamation, and took the lead in debate, not unfrequently received their instructions, without perhaps being aware of it, from Mr Jefferson; who could give counsel with so courteous and insinuating an address, as to control, without offending, the pride of opinion.

The principal attempt in which his philanthropic efforts were

unsuccessful, was the gradual emancipation of slaves, and the immediate inhibition of the traffic; and it is worthy of remark, that in his draft of the Declaration of Independence, one of the grievances charged upon the abjured sovereign was the constant negative which he put upon all laws passed in the colonies for the abolition of the slave-trade. His advocacy of the cause of the slaves is a proof, if any were wanting, that his motive for reform was not the desire of popularity, and that he was not disposed to flatter public opinion in order to obtain its support. On the contrary, he dared to attack it in a point where it was the most sensitive and intractable. In espousing the cause of the slaves he excited for the most part the jealousy of their masters. He could have no motive but the honor of his country and the impulse of humanity.

Mr Jefferson laid the basis of freedom in the mind. He knew all nations were not prepared for it. When he arrived in France and saw the people so blinded by superstition and ignorance as not to perceive their wrongs, though they were loaded with burthens of church and state which prostrated them to the earth, he did not suppose them capable of enjoying the benefits of a free government. And lately, when he saw the insurgent inhabitants of South America united in the effort to break from their colonial bondage, he expressed his apprehensions that they were not sufficiently enlightened to be capable of forming and supporting a government of their choice. The only alternative, which it is the misfortune of most nations to possess after a successful revolt, is anarchy or absolute power. They acquiesce in the authority of any one who, by force or corruption, has obtained predominance, and who will employ it in protecting them from the license of each other. It is the people who give character to institutions, and the confidence which Mr Jefferson had in the intelligence and good sense of the people of these states confirmed his belief in the adaptation of a free government to them. He wrote to Mr Adams,

‘I have been amusing myself latterly with reading the voluminous letters of Cicero. They certainly breathe the purest effusions of an exalted patriot, while the parricide Cæsar is lost in odious contrast. When the enthusiasm, however, kindled by Cicero’s pen and principles subsides into cool reflection, I ask myself, what was that government which the virtues of Cicero were so zealous to restore, and the ambition of Cæsar to subvert? And if Cæsar had been as virtuous as he was daring and sagacious, what could

he, even in the plenitude of his usurped power, have done to lead his fellow-citizens into good government? I do not say to *restore it*, because they never had it, from the rape of the Sabines to the ravages of the Cæsars. If their people indeed had been, like ourselves, enlightened, peaceable, and really free, the answer would be obvious. "Restore independence to all your foreign conquests, relieve Italy from the government of the rabble of Rome, consult it as a nation entitled to self-government, and do its will." But steeped in corruption, vice, and venality, as the whole nation was (and nobody had done more than Cæsar to corrupt it), what could even Cicero, Cato, Brutus, have done, had it been referred to them to establish a good government for their country? They had no ideas of government themselves but of their degenerate Senate, nor the people of liberty, but of the factious opposition of their Tribunes. They had afterwards their Tituses, their Trajans and Antoninuses, who had the will to make them happy, and the power to mould their government into a good and permanent form. But it would seem as if they could not see their way clearly to do it. No government can continue good, but under the control of the people; and their people were so demoralized and depraved, as to be incapable of exercising a wholesome control. Their reformation, then, was to be taken up *ab incunabulis*. Their minds were to be informed by education what is right and what wrong; to be encouraged in habits of virtue, and deterred from those of vice, by the dread of punishments, proportioned, indeed, but irremissible; in all cases, to follow truth as the only safe guide, and to eschew error, which bewilders us in one false consequence after another in endless succession. These are the inculcations necessary to render the people a sure basis for the structure of order and good government. But this would have been an operation of a generation or two, at least, within which period would have succeeded many Neros and Commoduses, who would have quashed the whole process. I confess, then, I can neither see what Cicero, Cato, and Brutus, united and uncontrolled, could have devised to lead their people into good government, nor how this enigma can be solved, nor how further shown why it has been the fate of that delightful country never to have known to this day, and through a course of five and twenty hundred years, the history of which we possess, one single day of free and rational government. Your intimacy with their history, ancient, middle, and modern, your familiarity with the improvements in the science of government at this time, will enable you, if any body, to go back with our principles and opinions to the times of Cicero, Cato, and Brutus, and tell us by what process these great and virtuous men could have led so unenlightened and vitiated a people into freedom and good government, *et eris mihi*

*magnus Apollo. Cura ut valeas, et tibi persuadeas carissimum te mihi esse.*' Vol. iv. pp. 319, 320.

Mr Jefferson's mind partook of the character which he wished to communicate to society. His speculations all manifest a feeling of independence, which allowed no authority to restrain him in the indulgence of his thoughts. It is remarkable, that he never quotes the opinion of any other as the foundation or motive of his own. In whatever respect he held the reputation of the great or learned, he did not pay them the deference of receiving their belief or their doctrines without investigation; for there are few fancies so extravagant in morals or philosophy, as not to have received, at some period or other, the countenance of great names, and to have been allowed by their sanction to pass current in society. Men learn early to give up their understanding, and relieve themselves from doubt by reposing their confidence on superior authority. Education, too often begins by dictating to the infant intellect what is above its comprehension, and, with the best designs on the part of parents and instructors, the young are expected to express their conviction before their judgment can be informed. Thus is produced a most unhappy inversion of the operations of the mind. Assent is made to precede inquiry, and the young, instead of being wise, are made credulous. As the good Catholic repeats his Latin prayers, which he does not understand, with ignorant devotion, so many among us are taught to attach importance to professions, the meaning of which they do not know, and thus cultivate an early disposition to become either hypocrites or bigots.

Mr Jefferson recommends to a young friend and relative a habit of the mind which allows the greatest indulgence to the spirit of research, tempered at the same time by just apprehensions of error or deceit,—a habit which is called by those who practice it free inquiry, and by those who condemn it, free thinking.

Mr Jefferson has certainly expressed his belief and his doubts on religious subjects without restraint. In dissenting from the opinion of others whose piety and wisdom are entitled to veneration, he has not undertaken to advance his own with the pride or bitterness of a sectary. He has not condescended to disguise his sentiments for fear of provoking opposition, nor has he been ambitious to obtrude them on the public in the conceit of making converts.

We wish not to conceal, nor would it be worthy of our candor, in reviewing the writings of Mr Jefferson, to attempt to conceal the fact, that his sentiments upon some points of the Christian religion are hostile to our own; nor is it to be inferred, that, because we advocate the liberty of unrestrained discussion of even the most sacred subjects, that we feel any complaisance for some of the conclusions to which he arrived. It is in dissenting from him that we recommend a latitude of investigation, which will evince the confidence of the advocate, and result in the best vindication of the cause. Why should we suspend the exercise of our highest faculties upon a subject infinitely important above all others; and do religion the discredit of supposing that, lest we become skeptical by inquiry, prudence would recommend a quiescent submission of the understanding?

There is no medium; men must either form opinions for themselves or adopt those of others; and the history of the world from the earliest period shows that they have generally taken the latter alternative. In the ages of polytheism, it was the policy of the priests, in conspiracy with the civil government, to place religion, not in the heart or in the understanding, but in the imagination. The beautiful fables of mythology were interwoven with history, and made the subject of popular poetry. They were ever present to the sight as well as memory. They were painted on their walls and engraven on the festal bowl. The pomp of ceremonies, the imposing mystery of rites, all supposed that religious impressions were to enter the mind through the senses; and so far was reason from being consulted, that things mysterious and impenetrable were intentionally introduced into the religious creed for the purpose of withdrawing it from the province of the understanding. If an impartial and philosophic view be cast over the history of the Christian church previous to the reformation, what is the impression produced by the manner in which the human understanding has been treated by the pious frauds, the interpolations and perversion of Scripture, the fabulous legends, the prodigies, the miracles operated by the saints during their lives, and, after death, by their relics? Since the reformation, how many various and opposing doctrines have been added to the Christian faith, incomprehensible subtleties, and metaphysical speculations, which neither consulted the nature of man nor the attributes of the Deity. These have been the more delusive, since they have gratified that love of the marvellous,

which is the infirmity of weak minds, and even of contemplative minds of more vigor; for they love to stray on mystic ground, and to lose themselves in the pursuit of dreamy abstractions. Mr Jefferson, therefore, exhorts his young friend to begin by an impartial and rational examination of the first principles of the religion of nature as well as revelation; and cautions him not to allow his imagination to become excited till his understanding shall be consulted on a subject where error is fatal, and where, if he adopt without examination the tenets of another, he must bear all the responsibility himself. These principles of Mr Jefferson cannot be censured; for if inquiry be permitted, who shall undertake to limit the extent of lawful research? No Christian, able to give a reason for his faith, will allow he has received any portion of it from human dictation. For as we believe religion to be the noblest employment of the understanding, the basis of the best affections, and the source of our highest happiness and hopes, so we feel that any obstruction, either on the part of sects, associations, or the state, to fair and candid research into its truth and extent, is an infringement of the best human liberty, the liberty of conscience.

Mr Jefferson was opposed to what he conceived to be corruptions of Christianity, but not to the precepts of our Savior, nor his character in the light in which he viewed it. These he held in the highest admiration. In one of the conversations which, during the intervals of public cares, he was in the habit of having with his friend, Dr Rush, on moral and philosophical subjects, he promised to give him in writing his views of the Christian religion. In accomplishing this, he formed in his mind a comparison of Christianity with the ethics of the most celebrated philosophers of antiquity. The appearance some time after of Dr Priestly's treatise of 'Socrates and Jesus Compared,' which anticipated one branch of his design, reminded him of his engagement. He therefore communicated to Dr Rush, in a letter (of April, 1803), 'a syllabus of an estimate of the merit of the doctrines of Jesus compared with those of others.' This he confided to his friend, with a request that he would not allow it to be exposed to the public view, and subjected to malignant perversions of its meaning. For he complained that the spirit of party had made every sentiment of his a theme for misrepresentation; and as, on the one hand, he did not intend by such an exposure to second the designs of those who wished

to draw his religious tenets before the public, he did not incline, on the other, to recognise the right of the public to erect itself into an inquisition over religious opinions. This estimate is concluded in the four following articles;

‘1. He corrected the Deism of the Jews, confirming them in their belief of one only God, and giving them juster notions of his attributes and government.

‘2. His moral doctrines, relating to kindred and friends, were more pure and perfect than those of the most correct of the philosophers, and greatly more so than those of the Jews; and they went far beyond both in inculcating universal philanthropy, not only to kindred and friends, to neighbors and countrymen, but to all mankind, gathering all into one family, under the bonds of love, charity, peace, common wants, and common aids. A development of this head will evince the peculiar superiority of the system of Jesus over all others.

‘3. The precepts of philosophy and of the Hebrew code laid hold of actions only. He pushed his scrutinies into the heart of man, erected his tribunal in the region of his thoughts, and purified the waters at the fountain head.

‘4. He taught emphatically the doctrine of a future state, which was either doubted or disbelieved by the Jews, and wielded it with efficacy as an important incentive supplementary to the other motives to moral conduct.’ Vol. III. p. 509.

It was when the French people were in vain attempting to establish a new government, that Mr Jefferson received the account of the formation and adoption of the constitution of the United States. His experience in America of the inadequacy of the first confederation to promote the common welfare coincided with the opinion he found prevailing in Europe. The Congress had no authority to enforce its engagements independent of the sovereign pleasure of each state, and having no direct revenue, the public credit was reduced to a degree unworthy of the country. Mr Jefferson was mortified to see in the *compte rendu* of Mr Necker, that neither the principal nor the interest of the sum due by us to France could be relied on with any assurance; and it will scarcely be credited that he was subjected to the importunities of the French gentlemen who had served in our armies, for trifling arrears, which he had not funds to satisfy. It may, then, be well conceived with what satisfaction he heard of the adoption of a constitution, combining in independent organization all the powers essential to good government, and presenting us to foreign nations in a

character of union respectable for its force, rich in its resources, and competent to all its engagements. Not that he looked with despondence upon his country at any time. When left by the war in a state of waste, exhausted by ourselves, and ravaged by the enemy, he yet saw imperishable riches in the quality of the soil and the enterprise of its inhabitants. When our credit was most depreciated in Europe, he insisted there were no funds in the world so secure for the investment of capital as our own; and at length when discontent in Massachusetts broke out in insurrection, he was so far from dreading its consequences, that he turned it into an ingenious argument in favor of the stability of our government.

‘Wonderful is the effect of impudent and persevering lying. The British ministry have so long hired their gazetteers to repeat and model into every form lies about our being in anarchy, that the world has at length believed them, the English nation has believed them, the ministers themselves have come to believe them, and what is more wonderful, we have believed them ourselves. Yet where does this anarchy exist? Where did it ever exist, except in the single instance of Massachusetts? And can history produce an instance of rebellion so honorably conducted? I say nothing of its motives. They were founded in ignorance, not wickedness. God forbid we should ever be twenty years without such a rebellion. The people cannot be all and always well-informed. The part which is wrong will be discontented in proportion to the importance of the facts they misconceive. If they remain quiet under such misconceptions, it is a lethargy, the forerunner of death to the public liberty. We have had thirteen states independent for eleven years. There has been one rebellion. That comes to one rebellion in a century and a half for each state. What country before ever existed a century and a half without a rebellion? And what country can preserve its liberties, if its rulers are not warned from time to time that this people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. The remedy is to set them right as to facts, pardon and pacify them. What signify a few lives lost in a century or two? The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants. It is its natural manure. Our convention has been too much impressed by the insurrection of Massachusetts; and on the spur of the moment, they are setting up a kite to keep the hen-yard in order. I hope in God this article will be rectified before the new constitution is accepted.’ Vol. II. pp. 267, 268.

It was the conviction of Mr Jefferson, that government is generally more disposed to encroach on the privileges of the

people, than the people are to resist the prerogatives of government ; that those who possess power are naturally inclined to increase it ; and that the best men cannot be indulged with it unless circumscribed by the most jealous restraints. He never seems to have had any apprehension lest the constitution of the United States should not convey powers adequate to government. Though it was the weakness of the first confederation that caused alarm for our safety, and its feeble steps were supported only by the voluntary aid of the states, which gathered round it from a sense of common danger, but when this was removed, withdrew themselves, each to act its part in the new character of sovereignty. Still the fears of Mr Jefferson were directed against the unwarrantable extension and abuse of authority. The menacing pretensions of the British Parliament had inclined him to dwell more upon the grievances than the benefits accruing from government. His early apprehensions were turned to this source of alarm. His patriotism took this channel. His mind, operated upon by this powerful sentiment, seemed to acquire a permanent bias, as the oak, long exposed to the force of a wind prevalent in one quarter, at length becomes permanently inclined in that direction.

This jealousy of authority, however, did not prevent him from giving his approbation of all the powers which are enumerated in the constitution of the United States. There is not one which he would have withdrawn from it. Being abroad during the contests which, on this question, agitated the country, and, absorbing all other feelings and interests, divided it into two great parties, he had the advantage of standing on neutral ground, and of forming the judgment of a dispassionate observer. His friends and all whose favor he valued were arrayed on opposite sides, and his opinion was awaited with much interest. On a question so delicate, had he been capable of disguising his sentiments, he might have answered with diplomatic evasion and avoided all offence. His responses might have been so oracular and ambiguous, as to be interpreted in favor of either party, and not to commit him in any event. But it is certainly honorable to the character of Mr Jefferson, that, while the success of the constitution was yet doubtful, approving it as a whole, he nevertheless took the responsibility of stating objections ; not addressed secretly to the disaffected, but openly to its friends and supporters. Before the government went into operation he wished to place around

it additional guards, lest it should pass its legitimate bounds. There were certain fearful prerogatives, which, lest government might incautiously assume them, he wished distinctly to denounce and place beyond its reach; as the prudent physician marks and labels poisons, carefully separating them from innocent medicines. He wished to see inserted into the constitution a bill of rights, recognising certain essential and inalienable privileges of the people and of the states. Most of these were afterwards, by general consent, made part of the constitution. Further reflection suggested to him other articles of precaution, giving more explicit security to the freedom of speech and of writing, exempting them from all restraint except where 'facts were alleged injurious to individuals, or the peace of the confederacy with foreign nations'; a further extension of the trial by jury to all cases of admiralty jurisdiction, except where a foreigner should be interested; additional provisions for the speedy operation of the writ of *habeas corpus*; precise limits to the extension of monopolies; a declaration that all troops of the United States should be *ipso facto* disbanded at the expiration of the term of service limited by Congress; and, finally, a prohibition that any but native citizens should serve in our armies in time of peace. But his predominant apprehension was, lest the president, being eligible from term to term, should at length contrive to retain his office during life, and ultimately to transmit it to his heirs. But the example of Washington, who retired after a second election, followed by the general sentiment that a longer continuance would be in any successor an invidious pretension, induced Mr Jefferson to wave this objection. He therefore approved the constitution, as far as it recognised the rights of the states and people, most cordially; in its other aspects, with some hesitation. He wished it success, and believed that future experience would discover and remedy any latent defects. The following extract gives the state of his opinions on this subject as early as the year 1788.

'The conduct of Massachusetts has been noble. She accepted the constitution, but voted that it should stand as a perpetual instruction to her delegates to endeavor to obtain such and such reformations; and the minority, though very strong both in numbers and abilities, declared *viritim* and *seriatim*, that, acknowledging the principle that the majority must give the law, they would now support the new constitution with their tongues,

and with their blood, if necessary. I was much pleased with many and essential parts of this instrument from the beginning. But I thought I saw in it many faults, great and small. What I have read and reflected has brought me over from several of my objections, of the first moment, and to acquiesce under some others. Two only remain, of essential consideration, to wit, the want of a bill of rights, and the expunging the principle of necessary rotation in the offices of president and senator. At first, I wished that when nine states should have accepted the constitution, so as to insure us what is good in it, the other four might hold off till the want of the bill of rights, at least, might be supplied. But I am now convinced that the plan of Massachusetts is the best, that is, to accept and to amend afterwards. If the states which were to decide after her should all do the same, it is impossible but they must obtain the essential amendments. It will be more difficult, if we lose this instrument, to recover what is good in it, than to correct what is bad, after we shall have adopted it. It has, therefore, my hearty prayers, and I wait with anxiety for news of the votes of Maryland, South Carolina, and Virginia. There is no doubt that General Washington will accept the presidency; though he is silent on the subject.' Vol. II. p. 319.

But it appears that subsequent experience discovered two germs of evil, which at first escaped the penetration of Mr Jefferson. These were the implied powers deemed necessary to the execution of those expressly given, and the independent tenure of the judiciary. The constitution, in giving Congress specific powers for certain objects of legislation, allows it 'to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the enumerated powers.' This incidental or supplementary authority, being applicable to an infinite variety of acts, could not be particularly defined. Mr Jefferson conceived, it enabled Congress merely to use such means as should be absolutely necessary to execute the powers expressly given, and without which the latter would be nugatory. The construction, however, which has prevailed, has extended the compass of these means, so as to comprehend all those which are *useful and conducive* to legitimate purposes, as well as those *absolutely necessary*. The first case in which a questionable application was made of the implied powers of Congress, was the establishment of a national bank. It was on this occasion that Mr Jefferson, and those whose political opinions he represented, made a loud remonstrance against this alarming extension of the constitution. They asserted that the construction, which

permitted this act of the national legislature, was one which would break down all the barriers erected to circumscribe the authority of the federal government and protect the rights of the states and the people ; that Congress would then enter into a boundless field of power, irresistible and without control. Such was the opinion which Mr Jefferson, while Secretary of State, delivered to General Washington. He concluded it by the candid avowal, that, unless the President should be satisfied by a comparison of the arguments for and against the bill in question, that it was unconstitutional, a just respect for the legislature should induce him to concur in its opinion.

Another unauthorized assumption of implied power was, in the opinion of Mr Jefferson, that of making roads, canals, and other internal improvements, within the jurisdiction of the several states. He regarded the inference as unfounded, that, because Congress has power 'to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare,' it has the power to do whatever it may think would promote the public good. That the meaning of the constitution was, that taxes were to be laid *in order* to pay the debts and provide for the general welfare, in other words, that the power conveyed was confined to the raising the revenue, and that the common defence and welfare were the *purposes* for which the revenue was to be raised ; and that the construction, which would give Congress the general power of providing for the common good, would supersede all the other enumerated powers, and extend the authority of government without limitation.

It is certainly creditable to the wise foresight of the framers of the constitution, that so few acts of legislation of considerable importance should have been occasions of doubt, whether they were included within the delegated powers ; and it is equally honorable to the general government, that there are not more subjects on which it can be pretended it has exceeded its limits. Yet most of these measures were offensive to Mr Jefferson, not so much because he thought them objectionable in themselves, as violations, in his opinion, of the constitution. In a protest, therefore, which he proposed to submit to the legislature of Virginia, he consented that the authority to make internal improvements should be comprised in an article to be added to the constitution by the legitimate majority of the states. The construction of Congress, however, upon these

subjects, seems to be already acceded to by the public ; if such an inference may be drawn from the acquiescence manifested in the repeated exercise of these powers. It being competent to any state to submit a proposition explanatory of the constitution, which, by obtaining a concurrence of the legitimate number, becomes a part of the constitution, a most salutary preventive is thus furnished against the permanent admission of any unconstitutional doctrine ; and that no such proposition on these subjects has been made with success, is a proof, that, in the opinion of the people, no manifest usurpation has been committed.

The second evil, which Mr Jefferson regarded as formidable in the constitution, was the great independence of the judiciary. He feared that the judges, holding their offices during good behavior, and being subject to removal only by impeachment and a vote of two thirds of the Senate, would feel that they possessed a freehold interest in the government ; that however virtuous and enlightened, they would hardly be impartial in the decision of constitutional questions ; and that, without being conscious of the influence of their political connexion, they would involuntarily incline to augment the authority of the general government, and increase their own jurisdiction. He therefore thought their appointment ought to be limited to 'four or six years, and renewable by the President and Senate.' They would thus, in his opinion, feel more dependence on the people, who, if dissatisfied with their conduct, would cause them to fail of a second appointment. In the independence of the English judges so much praised, he saw no argument for that of our own ; for there they were placed above the control of the crown for the benefit of the nation ; but here, he contended, it was for the benefit of the people that the judges should be under their control. These views seem to have been adopted by Mr Jefferson after there had arisen some unfortunate collision between the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and his own opinions ; an accident which would not be so likely to occur in the case of judges holding their offices at the pleasure of the executive. But it was to prevent subserviency in the judiciary to the other departments, that it was made coördinate and independent. The conduct of the judges of Charles the Second and James the Second was in the recollection of the framers of the constitution. They intended that the judges should decide according

to their own opinion, and not according to the inclination of the other branches of the government, and for that cause removed them from all influence of fear or hope. What is the duty of the judiciary? It is to decide between the constitution and the government, on the one hand; and on the other, between the government and the people; and is it believed, that judges, who depend on their scanty salaries for subsistence, will not be insensibly inclined to the wishes of those, to whose disposal their offices are to be periodically consigned? Are we yet to learn, that men, even those who have a character to lose, change their opinions and their principles for the purpose of recommending themselves to the choice of the President and Senate of the United States? Such a tenure of office would at once sink the character of the judge into that of the political partisan. The decisions of our court upon constitutional law would command no more respect than the political judgments of Wright and Jeffries do at present. Besides, if the evil apprehended be, that the judiciary, as at present constituted, is too inclined to stretch the prerogatives of the general government, why should it be supposed, that a greater dependence upon the President and Senate would operate as a check upon that propensity? Are they permanently exempt from the spirit of aggrandizement, charged against those who exercise power? Does the share, which the judicial department holds in the general government, produce a disposition adverse to the pretensions of the states; and that, which the executive holds in the same government, create opposite tendencies? On the contrary, is it not a fact, that, in most instances, since the formation of the government, the chief magistrate of the United States has been more disposed, after his entry into office, to extend the sphere of general authority than before? On the questions of the national bank and internal improvements, has he not acquiesced in doctrines which, before the possession of office, were considered by him unconstitutional assumptions on the part of the United States? Even the greatest measure of Mr Jefferson's own administration, the acquisition of Louisiana, was not only an extension of the territory, but also of the constitution of the United States. So that the apprehension, that the judiciary is now disposed to extend its grasp upon the prerogatives of the states and transfer them to the general government, would be at least as formidable if the judiciary were more dependent on the executive. The ju-

diciary are already sufficiently connected with the executive. The latter has the prerogative of nominating, for vacant or newly created offices, those judges whose character and constitutional opinions it may approve. New occasions of appointment frequently occur by the death of incumbents, and in the course of a few years the majority of the court is recomposed. Since Mr Jefferson's first subject of complaint occurred, all the existing members of the court, with one exception, have been nominated by himself or his successors.

Suppose, however, they should violate their duty? Is impeachment, as Mr Jefferson thinks, 'a mere scare-crow.' Cannot two thirds of the Senate be induced to convict a culpable judge, when in trials by jury an unanimous verdict can be obtained against other offenders?

Shall the judges then be elected for short terms by the people? Mr Jefferson cited with approbation the practice of the state of Connecticut. But since he quoted that authority, the good sense of that state has placed its judiciary on the same independent tenure as that of the judges of the Supreme Court of the Union. But it is impossible to collect all the votes of the people, so that a majority shall decide in favor of an individual. No officer of the United States is so chosen. An electoral college must first be appointed to make the selection. And will that body merit more the confidence of the people, than the one now provided by the constitution? When the inconvenience of any other mode of election, or tenure of the judicial department, is maturely considered, we shall become more satisfied with the present.

Mr Jefferson's theory of the rights of a people was carried to an extent quite original. He believed that no generation has power to bind the succeeding one; that the age, which has past, had buried with it all the rights and obligations given it by the law of nature; in a word, that the dead cannot control the living. This thought occurred to him when he reflected on the enormous burthens entailed on the nations of Europe, which absorbed all their resources to pay the expense of wars in which they never had an interest, and of which they then saw all the folly. It would indeed be a most salutary doctrine which should prevent one age, after it has exhausted its own means, from drawing on posterity for the supply of its extravagance, or the support of its ambition. Wars would be less ruinous, if they could no longer be carried on upon the

credit of those who are yet unborn. It would be well for a new generation to come upon a clear stage, and not find it thrown into disorder by the mad scenes in which the preceding actors have finished their tragedy or their farce. This, however, cannot be. There are no lines which separate and distinguish the generations of a community. That stream of existence never stops to admit of admeasurement. One age passes away from another as insensibly as the twilight fades into night. When we think the day is entirely gone, we may discover some doubtful rays still lingering in the sky. It would be desirable for Great Britain to be free from the incumbrances of a former period ; but how can she accept the benefits descended from her progenitors, without bearing the burthens attached to them ? With what conscience can she enjoy the inheritance, without discharging, as far as she may be able, the debts ? For after all the reproaches cast upon the past, it is certain, that, on balancing the account, the succeeding generations of men have in general received more than they have been engaged to pay. The world has been in a progressive state of improvement. Even the example of the follies and vices of our progenitors may be converted to our profit, as the chaff and stubble of one crop is made valuable nutriment to the succeeding. It is a great advantage, after all, to have been born in the latter ages of the world. The advance of knowledge and the arts of civilization has made the world happier as it has grown older. Discoveries, which anciently never came within the imagination of men, have been accomplished for our benefit. New combinations have made what was once inert and unprofitable, subservient to our gratification. The first tribes found the world in a state similar to the wild and savage wastes discovered by Van Dieman. That we are not left to occupy an earth like this, is owing to the gradual accumulation of benefits which one age has transmitted to another. There is no danger that posthumous obligations will crush the energies of a new race. When the weight becomes too heavy, the most patient of animals throws it off his back. The fate of the national debt of France, at the period of the revolution, is a proof, that men do not need any new principle to exonerate them from what they cannot without difficulty pay.

It would be practicable, if nations were so disposed, to establish the law, that no obligation, either political or pecuniary, should endure longer than the term of thirty-four years, which

is computed to be the average extent of the future existence of the majority of mankind living at any period. Mr Jefferson accordingly submits to his friend, Mr Madison, the expediency of inserting an article into the constitution of the United States prohibiting them from either contracting or paying any debt having a longer duration. Revolving in his mind the same principle of the limitation of the rights of a generation, he perceives it to be applicable to the constitution itself; and concludes, 'that every constitution and every law naturally expires at the end of thirty-four years. If it be enforced longer, it is an act of force, and not of right.' It would be injustice to Mr Jefferson not to add, that all the advantage he wished to be taken in the United States of this theory of obligations, should be against debts contracted after a public declaration of the principle. He wished to discredit and disable the borrower, not to procure the forfeiture of a just debt. He concludes his letter in the following words;

'Turn this subject in your mind, my dear sir, and particularly as to the power of contracting debts, and develope it with that cogent logic which is so peculiarly yours. Your station in the councils of our country gives you an opportunity of producing it to public consideration, of forcing it into discussion. At first blush it may be laughed at as the dream of a theorist; but examination will prove it to be solid and salutary. It would furnish matter for a fine preamble to our first law for appropriating the public revenue; and it will exclude at the threshold of our new government the ruinous and contagious errors of this quarter of the globe, which have armed despots with means, which nature does not sanction, for binding in chains their fellow men. We have already given, in example, one effectual check to the dog of war, by transferring the power of declaring war from the executive to the legislative body, from those who are to spend to those who are to pay. I should be pleased to see this second obstacle held out by us also in the first instance. No nation can make a declaration against the validity of long contracted debts so disinterestedly as we, since we do not owe a shilling which will not be paid, principal and interest, by the measures you have taken, within the time of our own lives.' Vol. III. p. 31.

Having been one of the leading promoters of our independence, Mr Jefferson was appointed a commissioner, with Dr Franklin and Mr Deane, to enter into a treaty of alliance and commerce with France. The state of his family, and his belief that his services here would be more valuable to his coun-

try, induced him to decline that office. A few years afterwards (1781), he received another appointment as one of the commissioners to treat for peace with Great Britain, under the mediation of the Empress of Russia, which for the same reasons he also declined. The appointment was repeated in 1782, but before he could embark for France, as he intended, news arrived that the provisional treaty had been signed by the other commissioners. The object of his mission being thus accomplished, he became again a delegate to the Congress, and made the celebrated report upon which the system of our currency has since been established. The dollar was proposed as the unit of computation, to be multiplied and divided in a decimal ratio. The advantages of this system can be duly estimated by those only who compare it with the inartificial modes of computation and the varying standards then prevailing in the several states.

He was appointed by Congress (May, 1784,) minister plenipotentiary, with Dr Franklin and Mr Adams, for negotiating treaties of commerce with foreign nations. Conferences were held in Paris with the ministers of Spain, Portugal, Prussia, Holland, Denmark, and Tuscany. But no treaty was effected except with Prussia and Morocco. The offer made was to place the commerce of each on the ground *gentis amicissimæ*. The American government was desirous of procuring a more general and permanent admission into the European colonies. This privilege, it was thought, might be purchased by the advantage of a most profitable commerce, which we might offer to the mother countries; that of exchanging their manufactures for our unwrought materials. But the resources of these states, impoverished by a long war, and discredited by an accumulation of debt, public and private, which they could not discharge, did not offer to foreign nations tempting motives to commercial engagements. The truth is, our commercial reputation was not highly appreciated by most nations of Europe. They viewed us in the light in which an old and prudent house of trade regards a young merchant who has acted with spirit and honor in vindicating his character, but, in doing it, has had the misfortune to lose his capital. With England in particular, the treaty of peace, not having been fully executed by either party, became the subject of mutual recrimination. The presence of Jefferson and Adams as ministers at the court of their former sovereign, probably revived the recollection of those

events with which their names were associated, and their advances were met with cold and uncomplying reserve. After repeated attempts to introduce a discussion with the minister, they were left to understand, by the ceremonious distance at which he placed himself, and the civil but total neglect of themselves and their proposals, that their errand was most ungracious.

While resident in Paris, Mr Jefferson was presented by Dr Franklin to the acquaintance of the learned, the literary, and accomplished. His official character gave him admission to the brilliant circles of the court, where he was received with flattering marks of the predilection then felt in France for America, added to the usual courtesy and grace so captivating in the best French society. His 'Notes on Virginia' had made him known as an author. The original and philosophical character of his remarks recommended the book to the prevailing taste. The French had become tired of the established order of things, of their old notions of government and religion, of the monotonous parade of church and state. A philosopher and republican from America, possessing high rank, but wearing no order or decoration, was, till the appearance of Dr Franklin and Mr Jefferson, a novel spectacle in the splendid *salons* of Paris. Assuming no distinction, the simplicity of their exterior attracted more notice. The natural amenity of Mr Jefferson's manners confirmed the advantages of the first impression. The cordial reception he enjoyed could not fail to predispose him in favor of French manners. Conversation changed according to inclination from severer topics to gay, and gave vivacity to all. Politics did not there, as in other countries, drive men into clubs, separating them from the female and most agreeable part of society. Parisian ladies made politics subjects of conversation, and imparted to them a new interest. In the *soirées* of the Chaussée d'Antin, a question of state policy was discussed with as much pleasure as the arrangement of an opera, or the merit of a ballet.

Besides M. Necker, whose character Mr Jefferson has drawn with great discrimination, he corresponded with Madame Necker and their celebrated daughter. The following letter, dated at Nismes, written during an excursion to the south of France and Piedmont, to Madame la Comtesse de Tessé, shows the sportive and versatile humor of Mr Jefferson, which could so well combine pleasantry and compliment with

the details of the arts and of politics. It besides gives us his first views of the French revolution.

‘Here I am, Madam, gazing whole hours at the *Maison Quarrée*, like a lover at his mistress. The stocking-weavers and silk-spinners around it consider me as a hypochondriac Englishman, about to write with a pistol the last chapter of his history. This is the second time I have been in love since I left Paris. The first was with a Diana at the Château de Laye-Epinaye in Beaujolois, a delicious morsel of sculpture, by M. A. Slodtz. This, you will say, was in rule, to fall in love with a female beauty; but with a house! It is out of all precedent. No, Madam, it is not without a precedent in my own history. While in Paris I was violently smitten with the Hôtel de Salm, and used to go to the Tuileries almost daily to look at it. The *loueuse des chaises*, inattentive to my passion, never had the complaisance to place a chair there, so that, sitting on the parapet, and twisting my neck round to see the object of my admiration, I generally left it with a *torticellis*.

‘From Lyons to Nismes I have been nourished with the remains of Roman grandeur. They have always brought you to my mind, because I know your affection for whatever is Roman and noble. At Vienne I thought of you. But I am glad you were not there; for you would have seen me more angry than I hope you will ever see me. The Prætorian palace, as it is called, comparable, for its fine proportions, to the *Maison Quarrée*, defaced by the barbarians who have converted it to its present purpose, its beautiful fluted Corinthian columns cut out in part to make space for Gothic windows, and hewed down in the residue to the plane of the building, was enough, you must admit, to disturb my composure. At Orange, too, I thought of you. I was sure you had seen with pleasure the sublime triumphal arch of Marius at the entrance of the city. I went to the *Arcnæ*. Would you believe, Madam, that in this eighteenth century, in France, under the reign of Louis the Sixteenth, they are at this moment pulling down the circular wall of this superb remain to pave a road? And that too from a hill which is itself an entire mass of stone, just as fit, and more accessible? A former intendant, a M. de Basville, has rendered his memory dear to the traveller and amateur by the pains he took to preserve and restore these monuments of antiquity. The present one (I do not know who he is) is demolishing the object to make a good road to it. I thought of you again, and I was then in great good humor, at the *Pont du Gard*, a sublime antiquity, and well preserved. But most of all here, where Roman taste, genius, and magnificence excite ideas analogous to yours at every step. I could no longer oppose the inclination to avail myself of your permission to write to you, a permission given with too much

complaisance by you, and used by me with too much indiscretion. Madame de Tott did me the same honor. But she being only the descendant of some of those puny heroes who boiled their own kettles before the walls of Troy, I shall write to her from a Grecian, rather than a Roman canton; when I shall find myself, for example, among her Phocæan relations at Marseilles.

‘Loving, as you do, Madam, the precious remains of antiquity, loving architecture, gardening, a warm sun, and a clear sky, I wonder you have never thought of moving Chaville to Nismes. This, as you know, has not always been deemed impracticable; and, therefore, the next time a *Surintendant des bâtimens du Roi*, after the example of M. Colbert, sends persons to Nismes to move the *Maison Quarrée* to Paris, that they may not come empty-handed, desire them to bring Chaville with them to replace it. *A propos* of Paris. I have now been three weeks from there, without knowing anything of what has passed. I suppose I shall meet it all at Aix, where I have directed my letters to be lodged, *poste restante*. My journey has given me leisure to reflect on this *Assemblée des Notables*. Under a good and a young King, as the present, I think good may be made of it. I would have the deputies, then, by all means, so conduct themselves as to encourage him to repeat the calls of this Assembly. Their first step should be to get themselves divided into two chambers instead of seven; the *Noblesse* and the Commons separately. The second, to persuade the King, instead of choosing the deputies of the Commons himself, to summon those chosen by the people for the Provincial administrations. The third, as the *Noblesse* is too numerous to be all of the *Assemblée*, to obtain permission for that body to choose its own deputies. Two Houses, so elected, would contain a mass of wisdom, which would make the people happy, and the King great; would place him in history where no other act can possibly place him. They would thus put themselves in the track of the best guide they can follow, they would soon overtake it, become its guide in turn, and lead to the wholesome modifications wanting in that model, and necessary to constitute a rational government. Should they attempt more than the established habits of the people are ripe for, they may lose all, and retard indefinitely the ultimate object of their aim. These, Madam, are my opinions; but I wish to know yours, which I am sure will be better.’ Vol. II. pp. 101–103.

While in Paris, Mr Jefferson became a witness of the first movements of the revolution, and the confidential friend of many of the men who were its promoters, and some of them its victims. Between him and Lafayette there had long been an attachment, founded on a union of services and of glory in

the same cause. With M. de Malesherbes, one of the council of state, and afterwards the advocate of the king on his trial, he had the most unreserved intimacy. He had intercourse with the diplomatic agents of the several cabinets, all of whom were curious to pry into the counsels of the court. Deriving his information from these sources, but particularly from his own observation, his letters contain the most lively and exact narration of the early transactions of that revolution, which are to be found in history. He was there a calm spectator, wishing, indeed, the reformation of the government, but not its overthrow. Loving the character of the French nation, he was hostile to the abuses that abridged its happiness. But he never advised or approved any of those measures which have incurred the reproach of posterity. Having all his life defended the cause of the people against arbitrary power, it was natural that his feelings should take part with the nation against the court. His zeal, however, for reform was rational and discriminate. He wished to preserve the monarch and limit his prerogative. So that his sympathies were turned to the side of the king when he saw the people, transformed into a mob, act the part of a despot. He always recollected the obligations of his country to Louis the Sixteenth, and does justice to the kindness of his disposition and the rectitude of his intentions. He was convinced it was not the king who opposed the wishes of the public, and believed that he was always ready to recognise their rights, and establish a constitution on that basis. In advocating the king, he cast the blame of all obstructions to the calm progress of the revolution upon those who controlled him; upon the queen and her partisans; upon the high clergy and a majority of the *noblesse*. It is singular how just was his perception of the errors of that period, before experience of their consequences had denounced them to all the world. He seized upon one or two occasions, when, if the king had made the concessions which Mr Jefferson hoped he would make, the nation would not have demanded more; when, having regained all the rights necessary to form the elements of a good constitution, they would have peaceably employed themselves in reorganizing their government. But when no concession was obtained but what was extorted, and that, subject to be retracted, the people lost all confidence in the crown, and did not feel themselves safe till they had reduced it to a state of impotency. Sometimes encouraging the hopes of the people, and at others

espousing the cause of the *noblesse*, the king by turns incurred the resentment of both, without acquiring the confidence of either. He says, in a letter to La Fayette,

‘Possibly you may remember, at the date of the *jeu de paume*, how earnestly I urged yourself and the patriots of my acquaintance to enter then into a compact with the king, securing freedom of religion, freedom of the press, trial by jury, *habeas corpus*, and a national legislature, all of which it was known he would then yield, to go home, and let these work on the amelioration of the condition of the people until they should have rendered them capable of more, when occasions would not fail to arise for communicating to them more. This was as much as I then thought them able to bear soberly and usefully for themselves. You thought otherwise, and that the dose might still be larger. And I found you were right; for subsequent events proved they were equal to the constitution of 1791. Unfortunately, some of the most honest and enlightened of our patriotic friends (but closet politicians merely, unpractised in the knowledge of man,) thought more could still be obtained and borne. They did not weigh the hazards of a transition from one form of government to another, the value of what they had already rescued from those hazards, and might hold in security if they pleased, nor the imprudence of giving up the certainty of such a degree of liberty, under a limited monarch, for the uncertainty of a little more under the form of a republic. You differed from them. You were for stopping there, and for securing the constitution which the National Assembly had obtained. Here, too, you were right; and from this fatal error of the republicans, from their separation from yourself and the constitutionalists, in their councils, flowed all the subsequent sufferings and crimes of the French nation. The hazards of a second change fell upon them by the way. The foreigner gained time to anarchize by gold the government he could not overthrow by arms, to crush in their own councils the genuine republicans by the fraternal embraces of exaggerated and hired pretenders, and to turn the machine of Jacobinism from the change to the destruction of order; and, in the end, the limited monarchy they had secured was exchanged for the unprincipled and bloody tyranny of Robespierre, and the equally unprincipled and maniac tyranny of Bonaparte. You are now rid of him, and I sincerely wish you may continue so. But this may depend on the wisdom and moderation of the restored dynasty. It is for them now to read a lesson in the fatal errors of the republicans; to be contented with a certain portion of power, secured by formal compact with the nation, rather than, grasping at more, hazard all upon uncertainty, and risk meeting the fate of their predecessor, or a renewal of their own exile.’ Vol. iv. pp. 247, 248.

Mr Jefferson was not a man to be placed on such a stage, and to be admitted behind the scenes, without knowing perfectly what was performed. For these advantages he had. He saw the attack upon the Bastile.

‘A committee of magistrates and electors of the city were appointed by their bodies to take upon them its government. The mob, now openly joined by the French guards, forced the prison of St Lazare, released all the prisoners, and took a great store of corn, which they carried to the corn-market. Here they got some arms, and the French guards began to form and train them. The committee determined to raise forty-eight thousand *Bourgeois*, or rather to restrain their numbers to forty-eight thousand. On the 14th [July, 1789.] they sent one of their members (Monsieur de Corny, whom we knew in America,) to the *Hôtel des Invalides*, to ask for arms their *Garde Bourgeoise*. He was followed by, or he found there, a great mob. The Governor of the *Invalides* came out, and represented the impossibility of his delivering arms without the orders of those from whom he received them. De Corny advised the people then to retire, and retired himself; and the people took possession of the arms. It was remarkable, that not only the *Invalides* themselves made no opposition, but that a body of five thousand foreign troops, encamped within four hundred yards, never stirred. Monsieur de Corny and five others were then sent to ask arms of Monsieur de Launai, Governor of the Bastile. They found a great collection of people already before the place, and they immediately planted a flag of truce, which was answered by a like flag hoisted on the parapet. The deputation prevailed on the people to fall back a little, advanced themselves to make their demand of the Governor, and in that instant a discharge from the Bastile killed four people of those nearest to the deputies. The deputies retired; the people rushed against the place, and almost in an instant were in possession of a fortification, defended by one hundred men, of infinite strength, which, in other times, had stood several regular sieges, and had never been taken. How they got in has as yet been impossible to discover. Those who pretend to have been of the party tell so many different stories, as to destroy the credit of them all. They took all the arms, discharged the prisoners, and such of the garrison as were not killed in the first moment of fury, carried the Governor and Lieutenant Governor to the *Grève* (the place of public execution), cut off their heads, and sent them through the city in triumph to the *Palais Royal*. About the same instant, a treacherous correspondence having been discovered in Monsieur de Flesselles, *Prévôt des Marchands*, they seized him in the *Hôtel de Ville*, where he was in the exercise of his office,

and cut off his head. These events carried imperfectly to Versailles, were the subject of two successive deputations from the States to the king, to both of which he gave dry and hard answers; for it has transpired, that it had been proposed and agitated in Council to seize on the principal members of the States General, to march the whole army down upon Paris, and to suppress its tumults by the sword. But at night, the Duke de Liancourt forced his way into the king's bed-chamber, and obliged him to hear a full and animated detail of the disasters of the day in Paris. He went to bed deeply impressed. The decapitation of De Launai worked powerfully through the night on the whole aristocratical party, in so much that, in the morning, those of the greatest influence on the Count d'Artois represented to him the absolute necessity that the king should give up everything to the States. This according well enough with the dispositions of the king, he went about eleven o'clock, accompanied only by his brothers, to the States-General, and there read to them a speech, in which he asked their interposition to reëstablish order. Though this be couched in terms of some caution, yet the manner in which it was delivered made it evident that it was meant as a surrender at discretion. He returned to the Château afoot, accompanied by the States. They sent off a deputation, the Marquis de la Fayette at their head, to quiet Paris. He had, the same morning, been named Commandant-in-Chief of the *Milice Bourgeoise*, and Monsieur Bailly, former President of the States-General, was called for as *Prévôt des Marchands*. The demolition of the Bastille was now ordered and begun. A body of the Swiss guards of the regiment of Ventimille, and the city horse-guards joined the people. The alarm at Versailles increased instead of abating. They believed that the aristocrats of Paris were under pillage and carnage, that one hundred and fifty thousand men were in arms, coming to Versailles to massacre the royal family, the court, the ministers, and all connected with them, their practices, and principles. The aristocrats of the Nobles and Clergy in the States-General vied with each other in declaring how sincerely they were converted to the justice of voting by persons, and how determined to go with the nation all its lengths. The foreign troops were ordered off instantly. Every minister resigned. The king confirmed Bailly as *Prévôt des Marchands*, wrote to Mr Necker to recall him, sent his letter open to the States-General, to be forwarded by them, and invited them to go with him to Paris the next day, to satisfy the city of his dispositions; and that night and the next morning the Count d'Artois and Monsieur de Montisson (a deputy connected with him), Madame de Polignac, Madame de Guiche, and the Count de Vaudreuil, favorites of the queen, the Abbé de Vermont, her confessor, the Prince of Condé,

and Duke de Bourbon, all fled, we know not whither. The king came to Paris, leaving the queen in consternation for his return. Omitting the less important figures of the procession, I will only observe, that the king's carriage was in the centre, on each side of it the States-General, in two ranks, afoot, and at their head the Marquis de la Fayette, as Commander-in-Chief, on horseback, and *Bourgeois* guards before and behind. About sixty thousand citizens of all forms and colors, armed with the muskets of the Bastille and Invalids, as far as they would go, the rest with pistols, swords, pikes, pruning-hooks, scythes, &c., lined all the streets through which the procession passed, and, with the crowds of people in the streets, doors, and windows, saluted them every where with cries of *Vive la Nation*; but not a single *Vive le Roy* was heard. The king stopped at the *Hôtel de Ville*. There Monsieur Bailly presented and put into his hat the popular cockade, and addressed him. The king being unprepared and unable to answer, Bailly went to him, gathered from him some scraps of sentences, and made out an answer, which he delivered to the audience as from the king. On their return, the popular cries were *Vive le Roy et la Nation*. He was conducted by a *Garde Bourgeoise* to his palace at Versailles, and thus concluded such an *amende honorable* as no sovereign ever made, and no people ever received. Letters written with his own hand to the Marquis de la Fayette remove the scruples of his position. Tranquillity is now restored to the capital; the shops are again opened, the people resuming their labors, and if the want of bread does not disturb our peace, we may hope a continuance of it. The demolition of the Bastille is going on, and the *Milice Bourgeoise* organizing and training. The ancient police of the city is abolished by the authority of the people, the introduction of the king's troops will probably be proscribed, and a watch or city guards substituted, which shall depend on the city alone. But we cannot suppose this paroxysm confined to Paris alone. The whole country must pass successively through it, and happy if they get through it as soon and as well as Paris has done.

'I went yesterday to Versailles to satisfy myself what had passed there; for nothing can be believed but what one sees, or has from an eye-witness. They believe there still that three thousand people have fallen victims to the tumults of Paris. Mr Short and myself have been every day among them, in order to be sure of what was passing. We cannot find, with certainty, that any body has been killed but the three before mentioned, and those who fell in the assault or defence of the Bastille. How many of the garrison were killed, nobody pretends to have ever heard. Of the assailants, accounts vary from six to six hundred. The most general belief is, that there fell about thirty.' Vol. III. pp. 4-7.

Having obtained permission to come to America at the close of the year 1789, for the sake of conducting home his two daughters, it was his desire to return to the duties of his mission among a people, in whose uncertain destinies he had taken so anxious an interest. In the mean time, Washington, desirous of availing himself of Mr Jefferson's acquaintance with our foreign relations, as well as his other peculiar qualifications, tendered to him the office of Secretary of State. He did not allow his hopes and inclination to form an obstacle to the wishes of the President; and as soon as they were signified to him, he accepted the post without hesitation. It required all the talents of Mr Jefferson. Our engagements with France were embarrassing. The treaty of peace with England, yet unexecuted, left subjects of fresh hostility. The powers of the new government were yet untried, its jurisdiction unsettled, and a jealous opposition already formed. The state papers of Mr Jefferson on the subject of our fisheries, on weights and measures, on the Indian tribes, on our commercial duties and rights, may be considered as models, whether viewed in relation to their learning, their liberal views, the strength of the argument, or neatness of the style.

It is well remembered, that in many of the prominent measures of the federal government, Mr Jefferson differed in opinion from his great rival, General Hamilton. The cabinet was, during the administration of Washington, composed of four heads of department. When great questions arose, the President was in the habit of submitting them to the discussion of those officers in his presence, and sometimes of demanding their opinions in writing. In many of them they were equally divided, and left with him the responsibility of the decision. He had the satisfaction, however, of knowing, that the whole subject of debate had been by such minds completely investigated, and that a judgment deliberately formed upon such arguments would not afterwards be disconcerted or surprised by new objections. He had only to bring to a centre the diverging light. General Hamilton and Mr Jefferson, as the latter remarks, 'were daily pitted in the cabinet like two cocks.' It does not appear that they entered into the arena with any feelings of personal antipathy. While attacking each other's opinions with warmth, they forbore from the resort of vulgar combatants, that of assailing each other's character. Though Mr Jefferson condemned the constitutional principles of Gen-

eral Hamilton, he bears testimony 'that he was an honest man.'

This composition of the cabinet shows the great force of the character of Washington. He began his administration with a divided cabinet. It was an experiment which had never succeeded in England. There a cabinet measure requires the support of every individual. It is true many questions have been brought before Parliament, such as Catholic emancipation and the slave-trade, where the king's ministers have arrayed themselves on opposite sides during successive administrations. But when a proposition becomes a government measure, if a member of administration does not lend it his support, he must quit his place. Though discrepancies in opinion be permitted on other subjects, they must occur so rarely as not to present the character of opposition. The features of the members may differ, but their physiognomy must bear a resemblance.

It cannot be said, that the public mind was not in commotion at the commencement of Washington's administration. The fact was, that the vessel of state almost hung on her ways, and at length was launched into a sea of troubles. The constitution, adopted by a small majority, had to encounter the hostility of states as well as individuals. Every exercise of its powers was viewed with suspicion; and yet the first duties of the government were the most difficult and responsible. It had to begin by assuming eighty millions of public debt. This, with some other leading measures of that administration, did not meet with the concurrence of Mr Jefferson. He had not indeed taken his seat in the cabinet when the funding system was established, but to parts of it, particularly the assumption of the state debts, he afterwards expressed his entire repugnance. It required all the confidence which the nation had in the judgment and patriotism of Washington to obtain a majority of votes for these measures. As he risked his character on their operation, he is entitled to more honor on the success of the result.

It is not our intention to pursue the public history of Mr Jefferson to a later period. It is well known, that, on the wane of the federal party during the presidency of Mr Adams, the republican, at the head of which was Mr Jefferson, became predominant. The transactions of his administration, which excited so much feeling, have not yet reached the mo-

ment when they may become subjects for dispassionate investigation. They have not yet parted with the heat which the excited spirit of the period gave them. '*Nam quis nescit, primam esse historię legem, ne quid falsi dicere audeat? deinde ne quid veri non audeat? ne qua suspicio gratiæ sit in scribendo? ne qua simultatis?*'

Beginning the perusal of these books with feelings far from partial to Mr Jefferson, we confess that, as we advanced from page to page, we gradually yielded to the proofs of the frankness of his character, his great learning, and various genius. It gave us pleasure when we felt, in our own mind, candor recovering its influence over old and indistinct antipathies, and doing a late justice to merit which had suffered from detraction. We have a national interest in the reputation of our great men, as the glory of the country. We would not have others lessen it. It is most painful to see any jealous attempt of themselves to tarnish the honest fame of each other. Franklin, the man whose character, next to that of Washington, has in Europe reflected most credit on this country, has but lately escaped from the danger of being deprived of his best honor, that of fidelity to his public trust.

With these sentiments we could not see without regret an appendix, which contains a short account of the official connexion of Mr Jefferson with the distinguished men first associated with him. It is written in 1818, and speaks of some of them in such terms of severity, as would neither seem just to them, nor compatible with the mild and urbane temper of Mr Jefferson. The narrative is followed by memoranda of conversations had by him, or reported to him, at different times from 1791 to 1806. It appears they were selected from a still greater number which he had destroyed. Most of these memoranda, it appears, were written immediately after the conversations were said to be held; those published were reserved by Mr Jefferson for the purpose of furnishing 'testimony against the only history of the period which pretends to have been compiled from authentic and unpublished documents.'

On reference to these memoranda, many of them do not pretend to be more than reports, by officious informers, of what had been said by third persons in moments of conviviality or excitement. Political opinions are alleged to have been expressed by men of high dignity and established reputation, which they invariably disavowed to the public, and would have

considered a deep reproach. Imputations of grave import were carried to the ear of Mr Jefferson against men whose characters are dear and untarnished in Massachusetts ; which, if the relators were entitled to credit, still rested on the veracity of third persons, had no basis but conjecture, and were certainly false. Reputation, founded upon a long life passed in the view of the public, should not be subject to detraction, which resorts for its materials to whispers, hearsay, and surmise. Mr Jefferson must have allowed his candor and discrimination to be imposed upon, when he suffered his suspicion to rest on the subject of the scandal, rather than the motive of the informer. Mr Jefferson did not fear that his own character would be stained by the numerous charges made against him, during the very period when these imputations reflecting on others were recorded. He never condescended to answer them. He said, ' Conversing with Mrs Adams on the subject of the writers in the newspapers, I took occasion to mention, that I never in my life had directly or indirectly written one sentence for a newspaper ; which is an absolute truth.' During those inflammatory days, no character was safe from being traduced. It is related in one of these articles, that Washington became extremely indignant, and ' ran on the personal abuse which had been bestowed on him, defied any man on earth to produce one single act of his, since he had been in the government, which was not done on the purest motives ;' ' that he had rather be on his farm than made emperor of the world ; and yet that they were charging him with wanting to be a king.' Admitting that General Hamilton said, ' he preferred the British constitution, with all its corruptions, to any government in the world ' ; this was the opinion also of Montesquieu, De Lolme, and many other distinguished civilians. In agreeing with them, did he harbor a thought unfaithful to the constitution of the United States, which he had assisted to plant in the very soil from which he had aided to weed the roots of this British constitution ? For a population containing privileged orders, it is true that the forms of the British government are best. Mr Jefferson recommended them to the French reformers. But it would be insanity to propose them to the people of the United States. Again,

' August 24, 1797. About the time of the British treaty, Hamilton and Talleyrand, bishop of Autun, dined together, and Hamilton drank freely. Conversing on the treaty, Talleyrand says, " Mais vraiment, Monsieur Hamilton, ce n'est pas *bien honnête*,

after making the Senate ratify the treaty, to advise the President to reject it." "The treaty," says Hamilton, "is an execrable one, and Jay was an old woman for making it; but the whole credit of saving us from it must be given to the President." After circumstances had led to a conclusion, that the President also must ratify it, he said to the same Talleyrand, "Though the treaty is a most execrable one, yet when once we have come to a determination on it, we must carry it through thick and thin, right or wrong." Talleyrand told this to Volney, who told it to me.' Vol. iv. pp. 502, 503.

Can it be supposed that these expressions did justice to the opinions of General Hamilton respecting the British treaty or its negotiator? It would seem that he recognised the justice of Talleyrand's remonstrance, that he had made dupes of his friends in the Senate, and imposed upon them the superfluous odium of ratifying an execrable treaty, which he intended the President should reject, but afterwards, for other reasons, thought he ought to ratify.

Tench Cox and one Beckley report to Mr Jefferson a variety of treasonable sentiments, which, whether said in jest or in anger, in moments of sportive festivity or of disputatious encounter during a wrangling session of Congress, are not surprising. The communicative diligence of Beckley, however, surpassed his discretion. His informations began to shake the confidence of Mr Jefferson; who notes one of them by saying, 'Beckley is too credulous.'

The facility with which expressions may be misapprehended, or do injustice to the intentions of the speaker, is shown in the last conversation which we shall quote. 'February the 6th, 1798. Mr Baldwin tells me, that in a conversation yesterday with Goodhue on the state of our affairs, Goodhue said, "I'll tell you what, I have made up my mind on this subject; I would rather the old ship should go down than not;" (meaning the union of the states.) Mr Hillhouse coming up, "Well," says Mr Baldwin, "I'll tell my old friend, Hillhouse, what you say;" and he told him. "Well," says Goodhue, "I repeat, that I would rather the old ship should go down, if we are always to be kept pumping so." "Mr Hillhouse," says Baldwin, "you remember, when we were learning logic together at school, there was the case *categorical* and the case *hypothetical*. Mr Goodhue stated it to me first, as the case *categorical*. I am glad that he now changes it to the case *hypothetical*, by adding, *if we are always to be kept pumping so.*"'

Now it is happy for Mr Goodhue, that his remark was not reported to Mr Jefferson in the sense in which it was first apprehended ; and that another occasion allowed him to repeat it in one less criminal.

What do most of these conversations prove, if correctly reported ? Not the real opinions of the speakers. For they have uniformly, on all grave and responsible occasions, avowed opposite opinions. Their conduct has been governed by opposite principles. They had no motive to disguise them. Are these fugitive remarks to be regarded as confessions of general hypocrisy ? No. They prove merely, that men in mirth, in the heat of argument, or in the spirit of contradiction, use expressions which they would not attempt seriously to justify. It is one of the indulgences which give delight to unreserved intercourse, that one may sometimes say an extravagant thing without expecting to be called upon to prove it reasonable, or to find it reported and recorded. Dr. Johnson, according to his amiable biographer, advocated duelling, and apologized for gambling. At the table of Sir Joshua Reynolds he said, speaking of claret ; ‘ Poor stuff ! No, Sir, claret is the liquor for boys ; port for men ; but he who aspires to be a hero (smiling) must drink brandy. In the first place, the flavor of brandy is most grateful to the palate ; and then brandy will do soonest for a man what drinking *can* do for him. There are indeed few who are able to drink brandy. That is a power rather to be wished for than obtained. And yet (proceeded he) as in all pleasure, hope is a principal part, I know not but fruition comes too quick by brandy.’

The most interesting portion of the correspondence is that which Mr Jefferson, towards the close of life, held with Mr Adams. They had been coadjutors in former days of trial and danger. They had labored side by side in the same field. At length the separation of parties estranged them from each other. Each retired from the helm of state to his farm, his family, and his books. Their early companions had almost all disappeared ; and they left alone among a new generation. The jealousies, inseparable from their late rivalry, neither of them wished any longer to feel or acknowledge, and whatever remained gradually gave place to the recollections of their ancient friendship. The infirmity of advanced age, which shows itself in the forgetfulness of recent events, while those of former days are still fresh in the mind, came in aid of their good

feelings. They more readily forgot the recent estrangement, and more easily returned to their former attachment. There was only wanting something to give occasion to the renewal of their correspondence. It thus occurred. Two of Mr Jefferson's neighbors having, by the invitation of Mr Adams, passed the day with him at Braintree; he remarked upon the injustice done by the licentiousness of the press to Mr Jefferson, adding; 'I always loved Jefferson, and still love him.' Mr Jefferson, in relating this anecdote, subjoins, 'This is enough for me. I only needed this acknowledgment, to revive towards him all the affections of the most cordial moments of our lives.' The ensuing remarks do honor to his candor and liberality.

'Changing a single word only in Dr Franklin's character of him, I knew him to be always an honest man, often a great one, but sometimes incorrect and precipitate in his judgments; and it is known to those who have ever heard me speak of Mr Adams, that I have ever done him justice myself, and defended him when assailed by others, with the single exception as to his political opinions. But with a man possessing so many other estimable qualities, why should we be dissocialized by mere differences of opinion in politics, in religion, in philosophy, or anything else. His opinions are as honestly formed as my own. Our different views of the same subject are the result of a difference in our organization and experience. I never withdrew from the society of any man on this account, although many have done it from me; much less should I do it from one with whom I had gone through, with hand and heart, so many trying scenes. I wish, therefore, but for an apposite occasion to express to Mr Adams my unchanged affections for him.' Vol. iv. p. 167.

Their former friendship thus revived, they continued to communicate to each other their opinions on government, morals, and religion. They amused their leisure by reviewing the speculations of Pythagoras and Plato, of Epicurus and Cicero, and derived a new pleasure from the studies of their youth, by applying to them the results of their long experience. The armor which, like old soldiers after their dismissal from honorable service, they could no longer use, it was their pride to keep polished and retain in their sight. While all the busy world around them was engaged in the contentions of party or of business, they were peacefully interchanging their reminiscences of early life; inquiring after their surviving and departed companions; correcting inaccurate relations of their

own history ; or comparing their reflections on the books which had become their resource and solace. It is to be lamented if now and then an unlucky spark from the passions of the world fell upon their retreat, and, enkindling an unhallowed flame in their own breasts, discovered that philosophy had not entirely removed from them all the old materials of combustion. Their strongest and latest feelings, however, were in favor of the liberty of men and of nations. It is a most interesting fact, which we repeat, that the last words of Mr Adams were those of patriotic ejaculation, responsive to the bell which then rung in celebration of the anniversary of our independence, and the last letter of Mr Jefferson was an expression of a hopeless wish 'to participate with his friends in the rejoicings on that day.' The same day, which had marked the most honorable epoch of their lives, was that in which Providence gave them the privilege to die.

The style and character of Mr Jefferson's writings resemble, in some respects, those of his friend Dr Franklin. They possess the charm of saying, without reserve or the appearance of studied ornament, the honest thoughts of the writer. They have a tone of good temper that wins the reader's partiality, and an earnestness that fixes his attention. They are like those well drawn portraits, which regard and follow us with their eyes in whatever direction we move. We do not suspect that the writer keeps anything back, but deals frankly and as a man of honor. In looking through this long series of letters, we find no change whatever in his principles. They continued in the same direction, extent, and impetus, through his life. If they overflowed the channels, in which prudence or reason would have confined them, he allowed them to pursue their natural course, and bear along or submerge whatever stood in their way. Another remark is, that whether he writes directly to an individual, or about him to a third person, the same sentiments are candidly expressed ; and his opinions of public measures are conveyed in the same unequivocal language, whether addressed to their supporters or opponents.

He frequently indulged in the use of new words ; and after his residence in France, his style was thought to partake of French idioms. There is, however, a great resemblance between his style in the page written in 1776, and that fifty years afterwards. The latter indeed flowed still more smoothly and with more facility. Perhaps, as was thought of Mr Hume,

the habits of expression acquired in the French language communicated to his sentences something of ease at the expense of energy.

Mr Jefferson also resembled Dr Franklin in the character of his mind and in his fortunes. Neither of them had a predilection for political concerns. The studies most congenial to their minds were the speculations of philosophy, the discoveries of science, and the pursuits of natural history. They each had a fondness for the mechanic arts. Engaged in similar objects, they enjoyed abroad the same scientific correspondence, and arrived at the same classical honors; and the traveller sees with pride their names associated and inscribed on the contributions, which America has made to the learned cabinets of Europe.

Dr Franklin also is more known as a writer than an orator. Some of his speeches are reported. Though they are distinguished by the peculiar and extraordinary features of his mind, and were always delivered with effect, yet it is remarked, that he never spoke longer than ten minutes. Mr Jefferson too, as has been remarked, wanting strength of voice, relied altogether upon his power of writing; and as nature is observed to compensate the loss of one sense by giving more force to another, so Mr Jefferson's disuse of public speaking seems to have thrown additional energies into his written composition.

---

#### ART. X.—CRITICAL NOTICES.

- 1.—*The History of Louisiana, particularly of the Cession of that Colony to the United States of America; with an Introductory Essay on the Constitution and Government of the United States.* By BARBE-MARBOIS. Translated from the French, by AN AMERICAN CITIZEN. Philadelphia. Carey & Lea. 1830. 8vo. pp. 456.

On a former occasion, when this work first appeared in France, we presented our readers with a brief analysis of its contents, and freely gave our opinion of its character and merits.\* We recur

---

\* See the North American Review for April, 1829, No. LXIII. p. 389.